

A STUDY ON MOONLIGHTING AND MULTITASKING: ETHICS OF DUAL EMPLOYMENT IN THE DIGITAL AGE

*** Dr. Abhijeet Rawal, ** Ms. Bhumi Chandrakant Rawal & *** Ms. Shruti Ram**

Research Students.

Abstract:

This Study explores the concept of moonlighting, where professionals hold secondary jobs along with their primary ones, focusing on its implications in the workplace. It focusses on investigating how moonlighting influences workplaces transparency and trust, its sustainability as a career strategy, and its imports ethics and inclusion. With the rise of the gig economy, digital tools, moonlighting has become more common, raising questions about its effects on productivity and relationships. Findings reveal challenges in maintaining trust and inclusivity, with gender dynamics playing a significant role. The study concludes that while moonlighting offers financial benefits, it can strain workplace ethics and sustainability. It includes fostering open communication and setting clear policies to balance dual employment with organizational goals.

Keywords: Moonlighting, Dual job, Ethics, Trust.

Copyright © 2025 The Author(s): This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0) which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium for non-commercial use provided the original author and source are credited.

Introduction:

In the digital age, the phenomenon of moonlighting - where individuals engage in secondary employment alongside their primary job - has gained significant attention, particularly in the context of multitasking and the evolving nature of work. This study examines the ethical implications of dual employment, exploring how advancements in technology have blurred the lines between personal and professional boundaries. With the rise of remote work and flexible schedules, employees often find themselves juggling multiple roles, raising questions about productivity loyalty, and the potential for conflicts of interest. This research aims to illuminate the complexities of moonlighting, offering insights into its impact on work-life balance, employer-employee relationships, and overall job satisfaction in an increasingly interconnected world.

Types of Moonlighting:

- **Blue Moonlighting:** Management responds positively to the employees' demands during the performance appraisal process and pays the

employees their wages and benefits. At the same time, few employees are not satisfied with these benefits, and they wish would get extra income through part-time jobs. They might be disappointed as they lack skills, as the ultimate result are not fruitful.

- **Quarter Moonlighting:** These are the employees who work as a part time employees after primary job as they are not happy with their salary.
- **Half Moonlighting:** The employees like to spend more amount on luxury items and at the same time also like to save money for the future, to maintain the balance of both the purpose the employees focus on the extra income.
- **Full Moonlighting:** The employees from certain profession have extra time or they do not match the expectation or when the other friends or relatives with the less qualification earns more income and higher status than them, then the employees look for the secondary job. These worker start their own business or continue with their regular job,

it determines their financial standing, it refers to full moonlighting.

Impacts of dual employment on employee well-being and productivity

▪ Positive impacts on financials well-being

- Enhanced financial stability – one of the primary reasons employees engage in dual employment is to improve their financial stability.

▪ Impact on job performance and productivity

- Limited time for rest and recovery – dual employment often results in less time for rest, leading to diminished cognitive function and

lower energy levels during work hours.

▪ Impact on family life and relationships

- Strained family dynamics- While the additional income is beneficial, dual employment can lead to strained family relationships due to long working hours and lack of quality time together.

▪ Organizational costs and legal implications

- Increased administrative costs- Managing employees who engage in dual employment may require additional resources from HR departments to monitor performance, compliance, and health.

Independent variable	Moderate variable	Dependent variable
Economic crisis & cost of living pressures.	IT	Financial stress
Social media influence & peer pressure.	IT	Career growth public perception of ethical behavior.
Company policies on dual employment (Moonlighting)	IT	Company Revenue and Profitability

Review of Literature :

Author	Research	Research Gap
1. Inkson (2006)	Financial motivation is a major factor in moonlighting, where workers take on extra work because they are unhappy with their pay or feel underappreciated. Fostering a motivated workforce requires addressing these issues.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited focus on moonlighting's impact on employer-employee trust. • Insufficient research on legal issues like intellectual property and confidentiality. • Lack of Longitudinal studies on the Effects of Moonlighting on career Trajectories in Tech.
2. Ashwini et al. G. Mirthula, S. Preetha, (2017).	Moonlighting is common in India's IT industry and investigating the practices financial and non-financial drivers. The study came to the conclusion that the number of hours spent on side jobs and the underlying reasons determine the type and extent of moonlighting.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The concept focuses limited demographic area. • The study had not examine the intention of moonlighting during the different phase of employee career
3. Semion and Adebisi (2019)	The research paper found that a leisure-oriented employment perspective, ineffective management techniques, paperwork, and poor leadership all contribute to prevalence of moonlighting. These actions are intended to increase the efficiency and productivity of the organization.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ethical Implications of Multitasking in Remote work Environments. • The Effect of Multitasking on Employee Privacy and Data Security • Ethical Considerations AI and Automation in Multitasking

4 Mukhopadhyay (2022)	The increase in entrepreneurship during the pandemic, especially among well-off people looking to start their own companies while working full-time. Employees who are worried about their job security may also look for extra work to help pay for necessities. This dual strategy reflects a move toward striking a balance between personal development and financial stability.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conflict of Interest in Dual Employment for Gig Workers. • Lack of Accountability and Legal Protections for Gig Workers with Dual Employment.
5. Ara, Kaukab; Akbar, Aisha (2016)	The study of the consequences of moonlighting on university employees' job satisfaction Teachers have studied how moonlighting affects work satisfaction, which is based on pay scale; skills, promotions, and appraisals are all evaluated in this study. According to the study's findings, a lack of salaries, promotions, skills, and appraisals results in a lower degree of work satisfaction.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current study had a focus on the university employees and did not take into consideration the employees of other sectors such as manufacturing, the IT sector, FMCG, etc. • The study had covered majorly the monetary factors (pay band, promotion) and did not cover the employee empowerment or work-life balance.

Research Methodology:

Objectives of the Study:

1. Investigate the influence of moonlighting on workplace transparency and trust.
2. To study the long-term sustainability of moonlighting as a career strategy.
3. To analyze the impact of moonlighting on workplace ethics and inclusion.

Hypothesis of the Study:

- (H₀): Moonlighting has no significant effect on workplace transparency and trust.
- (H₁): Moonlighting significantly affects workplace transparency and trust.
- (H₀): Moonlighting is not a sustainable long-term career strategy.
- (H₁): Moonlighting is a sustainable long-term career strategy.
- (H₀): Moonlighting has no significant impact on workplace inclusion, meaning it does not affect employees' sense of belonging, equality, or access to resources and opportunities within the organization.
- (H₁): Moonlighting has a significant impact on workplace inclusion, either by fostering increased opportunity and empowerment for employees or by creating inequities that hinder access to workplace resources and career growth.

Data Analysis:

The primary and secondary data used in this study was collected from the respondents, secondary sources such as reports, relevant research publications, and an online open-access journal. The key words used in the research are moonlighting, multiple jobs, organization ethical standards etc. The primary data collected from the IT professional from the Mumbai regions. Based on the current literature review the research conducted through structured questionnaire which consists of different questions such as demographics, age, employees' perceptions on the moonlighting, various variables on the Likert scale which include strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, strongly

disagree. The questionnaire tested with the reliability test which helps in understanding and getting clarity on the same. The online questionnaire is circulated via google forms to IT employees in the month of December 2024. The total respondent are 111 which are used for the further data analysis.

Limitation of the study:

1. The current research study focuses on the concept of moonlighting (dual employment) of the organization and no other component is considered for the research.
2. The research study limited to IT employees; no other sector/industry is covered for the same.

Demographic Data:

Demographic Profile	Frequency	Percent
Gender		
Male	61	55.0
Female	50	45.0
Total	111	100.0
Age		
under 18	11	10.2
18-24	54	50.0
25-34	33	30.6
35-44	9	8.3
45-54	4	0.9
Total	111	100.0
Industry		
Technology	20	18.0
Healthcare	19	17.1
Education	29	26.1
Finance	25	22.5
Retail	18	16.2
Total	111	100.0
Education		
0-5 years	31	27.9
5-10 years	32	28.8
10-15 years	29	26.1
15-20 years	16	14.4
20+ years	3	2.7
Total	111	100.0

1. Correlation with Gender wise and Variable 03 and 04

			PG	v03	V04
Spearman's rho	PG	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	-.571**	-.443**
		Sig. (1-tailed)	.	.000	.000
		N	111	111	111
	v03	Correlation Coefficient	-.571**	1.000	.784**
		Sig. (1-tailed)	.000	.	.000

		N	111	111	111
	V04	Correlation Coefficient	-.443**	.784**	1.000
		Sig. (1-tailed)	.000	.000	.
		N	111	111	111

Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).

Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	111	100.0
	Excluded	0	.0
	Total	111	100.0

a. List wise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

reliability Statistics

	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
Cronbach's Alpha	.939	34

Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Squared Multiple Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
V01	83.333	661.279	.124	.351	.940
V02	83.523	651.106	.568	.580	.939
v03	77.910	711.828	-.404	.745	.955
V04	77.784	714.989	-.428	.777	.955
V05	82.658	643.027	.344	.675	.939
V06	82.748	647.681	.303	.702	.939
V07	82.676	651.330	.238	.609	.940
V08	82.847	639.549	.456	.505	.938
V09	82.829	640.125	.458	.649	.938
V10	82.802	642.342	.408	.660	.939
V11	82.865	642.954	.395	.657	.939
V12	82.045	609.171	.759	.753	.935
V13	82.360	613.960	.790	.814	.935
V14	82.387	616.549	.757	.818	.936

V15	82.414	608.736	.796	.819	.935
V16	82.604	614.569	.781	.845	.935
V17	82.550	611.432	.780	.850	.935
V18	82.595	610.752	.771	.793	.935
V19	82.108	606.952	.833	.881	.935
V20	82.270	618.944	.772	.773	.936
V21	82.514	614.761	.781	.806	.935
V22	82.477	615.634	.768	.795	.935
V23	82.766	612.199	.789	.902	.935
V24	82.216	611.935	.817	.801	.935
V25	82.360	617.687	.767	.814	.936
V26	82.477	612.161	.816	.857	.935
V27	82.748	613.772	.822	.885	.935
V28	82.793	608.020	.844	.899	.935
V29	82.351	607.248	.809	.868	.935
V30	82.532	611.469	.777	.811	.935
V31	82.495	610.834	.816	.813	.935
V32	82.658	610.245	.796	.823	.935
V33	82.802	606.651	.864	.873	.934
V34	82.856	620.634	.759	.771	.936

Data Interpretation: The current research study had conducted the cronbach's alpha test using spss software which show the value of 0.939 on the scale which indicate highly reliable.

PERCENTAGE ANALYSIS:

An approach for analysing data in percentage analysis, which compares and determines data utilising percentages. Percentages are utilized in several categories, such as science, research, and healthcare, and are an essential aspect of data analysis and statistical interpretation.

Employee Transparency

Q: In your opinion employees being not transparent about moonlighting, could negatively impact the workplace ethical standards.	
Gender	Average Score
Female	5.34
Male	8.21
Grand Total	6.92

Table 1.1

The above table clearly shows the difference in opinion of male and female employees about moonlighting and its impact on workplace ethical standard. The average score is 6.92. The male employees rated it higher at 8.21, while

female gave it a score of 5.34. This may come from how each gender experiences the workplace or how much they know about moonlighting. Male, who scored it higher, might tie moonlighting to problems like poor ethics, lower productivity, or issues with loyalty.

Moonlighting Perceptions

In your opinion moonlighting may reduce employees' focus on their primary job, leading to decrease trust from their employer.	
Gender	Average Score
Female	5.82
Male	8.05
Grand Total	7.05

Table 1.2

The above table shows how male and female employee with a view, moonlighting differently when it comes to employee focus and employer trust. Male rated higher scoring on an average of 8.05, while female scored it at 5.82. The overall average score is 7.05. This leads to difference might come from male looking moonlighting as a bigger threat to loyalty and productivity at work. They may think that when someone juggles multiple jobs, it can really hurt or break employer trust, since trust is tied to steady performance. Female might see things differently. They could think the effects of moonlighting are less serious. This could be because they have different priorities for work and life or a different view on handling multiple tasks.

ANOVA ANALYSIS:

ANOVA (Analysis of variance) is a statistical technique utilized in research to identify if there are significant differences among the means of three or more groups. It assesses the variance among groups in relation to the variance groups to evaluate the impact of one or more independent variables. A significant outcome indicates that at least one group means different. ANOVA is commonly employed in experimental research to analyze the effects of treatments or interventions.

Encouraging Open Communication with Employers on Personal and Professional Matters

Table 1.3

Anova: Single Factor						
SUMMARY						
<i>Groups</i>	<i>Count</i>	<i>Sum</i>	<i>Average</i>	<i>Variance</i>		
PA	111	274	2.468468468	0.833087633		
V01	111	166	1.495495495	0.252252252		
ANOVA						
<i>Source of Variation</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>P-value</i>	<i>F crit</i>
Between Groups	52.54054054	1	52.54054054	96.81859342	3.63618E-19	3.884074683
Within Groups	119.3873874	220	0.542669943			
Total	171.9279279	221				
Reject the H ₀ , as the P value is less than 0.05						
The employees feel encourage to communicate to employer about personal and professional issues						

The Anova test shows there's a big difference between the PA and V01 groups. The P-value is 3.63618E-19. The p-value is less than 0.05. This leads to moonlighting having a strong impact on employees who feel encouraged to communicate personal and professional issues.

Exploring the Role of Moonlighting in Fostering Workplace Trust and Work-Life Balance

Anova: Single Factor						
SUMMARY						
<i>Groups</i>	<i>Count</i>	<i>Sum</i>	<i>Average</i>	<i>Variance</i>		
PA	111	274	2.468468468	0.833087633		
V02	111	145	1.306306306	0.214414414		
ANOVA						
<i>Source of Variation</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>P-value</i>	<i>F crit</i>
Between Groups	74.95945946	1	74.95945946	143.1204066	9.78082E-26	3.884074683
Within Groups	115.2252252	220	0.523751024			
Total	190.1846847	221				
Reject the H0, as the P value is less than 0.05						
The moonlighting can help build trust in the workplace by promoting openness and work-life balance						

Table 1.4

The Anova test shows there's a big difference between the PA and V02 groups. The P-value is low at 9.78E-26. That's way below the cutoff of 0.05. This means moonlighting has a strong impact on how balanced people feel about work and life. People in the PA group believe moonlighting helps build trust. They feel their needs outside of work are noticed. When there's openness, the workplace becomes more supportive. This helps people align their personal and work goals. It also boosts trust between employees and bosses

The Impact of Moonlighting on Employee Commitment to Organizational Values and Culture

Anova: Single Factor						
SUMMARY						
<i>Groups</i>	<i>Count</i>	<i>Sum</i>	<i>Average</i>	<i>Variance</i>		
PA	111	274	2.468468468	0.833087633		
V12	111	309	2.783783784	2.043734644		
ANOVA						
<i>Source of Variation</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>P-value</i>	<i>F crit</i>
Between Groups	5.518018018	1	5.518018018	3.836189717	0.051421042	3.884074683
Within Groups	316.4504505	220	1.438411138			
Total	321.9684685	221				
Accept H0 as the P value is more than 0.05						
The moonlighting impacts employees' commitment to organizational values and culture Accept the H0 as the P Value is more than 0.05						

Table 1.5

The Anova analysis shows that the p-value (0.0514) exceeds the significance level of 0.05, resulting in the acceptance of the null hypothesis (H_0). This suggests that there is insufficient statistical evidence to indicate that moonlighting affects employee's dedication to organizational values and culture. Although the p-value is slightly above the cutoff,

the findings imply that any differences observed are probably the result of random variation rather than a genuine effect. Additional studies with larger sample size or improved methodologies may yield further insights into the connection between moonlighting and organizational commitment.

Reasons Why Moonlighting Employees May Face Exclusion from Team Activities or Projects

Anova: Single Factor						
SUMMARY						
<i>Groups</i>	<i>Count</i>	<i>Sum</i>	<i>Average</i>	<i>Variance</i>		
PA	111	274	2.468468468	0.833087633		
V19	111	302	2.720720721	1.857657658		
ANOVA						
<i>Source of Variation</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>P-value</i>	<i>F crit</i>
Between Groups	3.531531532	1	3.531531532	2.624946734	0.10662851	3.884074683
Within Groups	295.981982	220	1.345372645			
Total	299.5135135	221				
Accept the H0 as the P value is more than 0.05						
The moonlighting employees are more likely to be excluded from team activities or projects.						

Table 1.6

The Anova analysis indicates that the p-value (0.1066) is greater than the significance threshold of 0.05, resulting in the acceptance of the null hypothesis (H_0). This means there is no statistically significant evidence to suggest that moonlighting employees are more likely to be excluded from team activities or projects. The p-value, being higher than the cutoff, implies that any observed differences are likely due to chance rather than a meaningful effect. Further investigation is recommended to examine this relationship in greater depth.

Balancing Two Jobs: The Ethical Costs of Moonlighting.

Anova: Single Factor						
SUMMARY						
<i>Groups</i>	<i>Count</i>	<i>Sum</i>	<i>Average</i>	<i>Variance</i>		
PA	111	274	2.468468468	0.833087633		
V24	111	290	2.612612613	1.603112203		
<i>Source of Variation</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>P-value</i>	<i>F crit</i>
Between Groups	1.153153153	1	1.153153153	0.946681907	0.331633893	3.884074683
Within Groups	267.981982	220	1.218099918			
Total	269.1351351	221				
Accept the H0 as the P value is more than 0.05						
The moonlighting employees face additional pressure to meet the ethical standards of both jobs.						

Table 1.7

The anova test was conducted to assess whether moonlighting employees face additional ethical pressure compared to those with a single job. The result showed a p-value of 0.3316, which is greater than the 0.05 significance level. Therefore, we accept the null hypothesis and conclude that there is no significant difference in ethical pressure between moonlighting employees and those with only one job. This suggests that dual employment does notably increase ethical pressure.

Research Findings:

- A value of 0.939 suggests a significant positive correlation ($p < 0.05$) between dual employment and productivity.
- This shows there's a big difference between the PA and V01 groups. The P-value is 3.63618E-19. The p-value is less than 0.05.
- This test shows there's a big difference between the PA and V02 groups. The P-value is low at 9.78E-26. That's way below the cutoff of 0.05.
- The analysis shows that the p-value (0.0514) exceeds the significance level of 0.05, resulting in the acceptance of the null hypothesis.
- The analysis indicates that the p-value (0.1066) is greater than the significance threshold of 0.05, resulting in the acceptance of the null hypothesis.
- The test was conducted to assess whether moonlighting employees face additional ethical pressure compared to those with a single job. The result showed a p-value of 0.3316, which is greater than the 0.05 significance level.

Recommendation:

1. Organization can implement the flexible working hours in the organization, or they can implement the guidelines for the moonlighting employees to enhance their productivity of dual employment without compromising on the ethical standards of the organization.
2. Organization should give more career opportunities for employees, so the feeling of second job will get reduce.
3. Organization should link employee's performance with the monetary rewards and job satisfaction

level, as both the component plays a crucial role in every employees life.

Conclusion: In conclusion, moonlighting and multitasking can be a productive and feasible agreement in the digital era while challenging traditional dual employment thought. Organizational policies, therefore, need to be reappraised to embrace such changes in work nature. Ultimately, embracing dual employment can result in higher productivity, job satisfaction, and retention of talents.

References:

1. Inkson, K. (2006). *Protean and boundaryless careers as metaphors*. J. Vocat. Behav. 69, 48–63. Doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2005.09.004.
2. O Simeon (December 2019), "Comparative Study of Determinants of Moonlighting in the Private and Public Sectors of EKITI State, Nigeria". *International Review of Management and Business Research*, Vol. 8 Issue.4 ISSN: 2306-9007.
3. Mukhopadhyay, S. (2022). *Moonlighting; Why do people take up second job anyway?* Retrieved from Mint: <https://www.livemint.com/news/india/why-moonlighting-why-do-people-take-up-a-second-job-anyway-11661918379778.html>
4. A. Ashwini, 2G. Mirthula and 3 S. Preetha, (2017), *Moonlighting Intentions of Middle Level Employees of Selected IT Companies*, Volume 114 No. 12, ISSN: 1311-8080 (printed version); ISSN: 1314-3395 (on-line version).
5. Ara, Kaukab; Akbar, Aisha (2016), *A Study of Impact of Moonlighting Practices on Job Satisfaction of the University Teachers*, *Bulletin of Education and Research*, v38 n1 p101-116, ISSN-0555-7747.

Cite This Article: Dr. Rawal A., Ms. Rawal B.C. & Ms. Ram S. (2025). A Study on moonlighting and multitasking: Ethics of dual employment in the digital age. In *Aarhat Multidisciplinary International Education Research Journal*: Vol. XIV (Number I, pp. 91–100). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15250826>